

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

By this Amendment, claims 1, 17, 18, 20, 29, 33, and 39 are amended. Claims 1, 20, and 33 are amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention and address the issues raised in items 3(a)-(b) of the Office Action. Claims 17 and 18 are amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention and address the issues raised in items 3(c) of the Office Action. Claims 29 and 39 are amended to clarify the definition of the copolymer. Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration.

Section 112, second paragraph. The Office Action rejected claims 1-41 under Section 112, second paragraph. Claims 1, 17, 18, 20, and 33 are amended to address the issues raised in the Office Action. Applicants submit that the amended claims are sufficiently clear and definite. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Section 112, first paragraph. The Office Action rejected claims 29 and 39 under Section 112, first paragraph for failing to comply with the written description requirement. According to the Examiner, there is no written description in the specification of the "copolymer" defined in claims 29 and 39. Claims 29 and 39 have been amended to address this rejection.

Regarding the copolymer definition in claim 29, the Examiner is referred to general formula (1) on page 16 of a typical diblock copolymer, formula (4) on page 17 of a typical triblock copolymer, formula (7) on page 18 of a typical triblock copolymer having activated end groups, and the general formula (8) on page 18 of a diblock or triblock copolymer having an activated end group. The formula of claim 29 is based upon the forgoing formulas and their definitions recited in the specification.

Regarding the copolymer definition in claim 33, the Examiner is referred to the formulas mentioned above, particularly formulas (1), (4), and (8). The formula is written as a general formula of a diblock or triblock copolymer with terminal -OH groups similar to formula 4, but with the general definitions of formula (8). Applicants submit that there is adequate written description for the amended formulas of claims 29 and 39. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Obviousness-type Double Patenting. The Office Action rejected claims 1-41 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over

Appl. No. 10/748,061
Amdt. dated February 28, 2006
Reply to Office Action of August 29, 2005

claims 1-33 of U.S. Patent No. 6,284,503. In response to this rejection Applicants submit a Terminal Disclaimer. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If there are any remaining issues preventing allowance of the pending claims that may be clarified by telephone, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Evan R. Witt
Reg. No. 32,512
Attorney for Applicants

Date: February 28, 2006

MADSON & AUSTIN
Gateway Tower West
15 West South Temple, Suite 900
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101
Telephone: 801/537-1700